

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Examiner has rejected claim 33 under 35 USC § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Tanaka et al. Currently amended claim 33 claims a method for displaying live continuous video, comprising:

encoding video into a low-resolution low-bit rate stream and a higher-resolution higher-bit rate stream;

displaying a single image of the video using the higher-resolution higher-bit rate stream; and

performing at least one of the following actions:

displaying a 2x2 array of the video using the higher-resolution higher-bit rate stream;

displaying a 3x3 array of the video using the low-resolution low-bit rate stream;

displaying a 4x4 array of the video using the low-resolution low-bit rate stream.

Applicants do not believe that Tanaka teaches, suggests, or differentiates between:

- a) encoding video into two distinct bit-rate streams: a *low-resolution low-bit rate* stream AND a *higher-resolution higher-bit rate* stream; AND
- b) displaying a single image of the video using the higher-resolution higher-bit rate stream; AND
- c) displaying a 2x2 array using the *low-resolution low-bit rate* stream; and/or

- d) displaying a 3x3 array using the *higher-resolution higher-bit rate* stream; and/or
- e) displaying a 4x4 array of the video using the *low-resolution low-bit rate* stream.

Applicant believes they have complied with 37 CFR 1.111(b) and (c) because the current language of claim 33 patentably distinguishes it from the references and because the current language of claim 33 clearly points out the patentable novelty in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references and objections. More specifically, and pointing to how currently amended claim 33 avoids the references cited and objections made, Applicant has amended claim 33 to include: encoding video into two distinct bit-rate streams (a *low-resolution low-bit rate* stream AND a *higher-resolution higher-bit rate* stream) AND displaying a single image of the video using the higher-resolution higher-bit rate stream AND displaying a 2x2 array using the *low-resolution low-bit rate* stream AND/OR displaying a 3x3 array using the *higher-resolution higher-bit rate* stream AND/OR displaying a 4x4 array of the video using the *low-resolution low-bit rate* stream. Applicant does not believe that Tanaka, nor any of the art of record teaches or suggests, whether taken singly or in combination,:

encoding video into two distinct bit-rate streams (a *low-resolution low-bit rate* stream AND a *higher-resolution higher-bit rate* stream) AND displaying a single image of the video using the higher-resolution higher-bit rate stream AND displaying a 2x2 array using the *low-resolution low-bit rate* stream; or

encoding video into two distinct bit-rate streams (a *low-resolution low-bit rate* stream AND a *higher-resolution higher-bit rate* stream) AND displaying a single image of the video


using the higher-resolution higher-bit rate stream AND displaying a 2x2 array using the *low-resolution low-bit rate* stream AND displaying a 3x3 array using the *higher-resolution higher-bit rate* stream; or

encoding video into two distinct bit-rate streams (a *low-resolution low-bit rate* stream AND a *higher-resolution higher-bit rate* stream) AND displaying a single image of the video using the higher-resolution higher-bit rate stream AND displaying a 2x2 array using the *low-resolution low-bit rate* stream AND displaying a 3x3 array using the *higher-resolution higher-bit rate* stream AND displaying a 4x4 array of the video using the *low-resolution low-bit rate* stream.

As such, it is respectfully requested that currently amended claim 33 is in condition for allowance and it be passed to allowance.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful to the allowance of this application, a telephone conference is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Raffi Gostanian, Jr.  
Reg. No. 42,595

6/6/06  
Date